

REMARKS

The Applicant appreciates the continued thorough examination of the subject application. By this amendment certain claims have been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejections and more concisely claim and describe the present invention. Claims 1-4, 8-12, 13, 15-20 remain in the application for reconsideration by the Examiner. The Examiner's allowance of all pending claims is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under Section 103(a) as unpatentable over Jaisimha ("Data Compression Techniques for Maps" IEEE Proceedings, 1989 SoutheastCon, pages 878-883) and Mairs (6,304,928).

The Applicant proposes to amend claim 1 as indicated above. In particular, new paragraph steps (a) -- (c) have been added: "(a) creating the graphical image data for a geographical region; (b) determining a projected vehicle path; (c) eliminating from the graphical image those pixels more than a predetermined distance from the path." Step (d) has been revised to refer to the pixels of the graphical image. Support for these changes can be found in the specification primarily in paragraph [0023].

The cited Jaisimha article generally describes run length data coding techniques. Mairs discloses a technique for encoding color pixels that do not fit into one of the other presented encoding formats, such as the foreground run and background run encoding techniques.

As amended, the Applicant's claim 1 refers to a graphical image for a geographical region and a projected vehicle path. Prior to the step of scanning, pixels more than a predetermined distance from the projected path are eliminated from the graphical image. Thus the scanning and compression processes are executed only on the remaining image pixels. None of the cited art discloses the invention as set forth in amended claim 1 and thus the claim is believed to be allowable over the art.

The remaining claims within the first claim set, i.e. claims 2-12 have been rejected over various combinations of the cited art to Matsushiro (6,301,300), Imade (5,872,864), Tateyama (5,517,077), Cullen (5,781,665), Kelly (6,448,922) and Ozaki (5,345,316), as concisely set forth in the Office Action. The Applicants have revised certain of these dependent claims solely to comport with the amendments to claim 1 from which they depend. Given the amendments to

claim 1 and recognizing that each of the retained dependent claims recites other patentably distinguishable features of the present invention, it is suggested that the dependent claims 2-4 and 8-12 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 5-7 have been cancelled, with the Applicant reserving the right to prosecute these or similar claims in a continuing application. Cancellation of these claims is not to be construed as an admission as to the validity of the rejection or the applicability of the cited art.

Independent claim 13 stands rejected under Section 103(a) as unpatentable over Jaisimha, Mairs, Matsushiro, Cullen, Imade and Kelly.

Claim 13 has been amended as set forth above. In particular, the claim now includes a reference to geographical area boundaries and a step of changing the color of the boundaries to a color of the background pixels. In the citation of other claims in the application, the patent to Fukumoto (JP 2001-265316) and the patent to Waguri (6,370,278) have been cited as relevant to boundary-type limitations. However, Waguri discloses boundary information between different colors of the same lightness. The boundary information is superimposed on a monochrome image to aid in distinguishing the colors of the same lightness. Fukumoto discloses "coloring the outlined part in the same color as that of the background area." Therefore since none of the cited references discloses or suggests the elements of claim 13 as amended, the claim is believed to be patentable over the art.

As to rejected dependent claims 14-16 depending from claim 13 and all rejected under different combinations of Jaisimha, Mairs, Matsushiro, Cullen, Imade, Kelly and Fukumoto, it is suggested that claims 15 and 16 each includes one or more elements that further distinguish over the art of record and therefore these claims should be in condition for allowance.

Claim 14 has been cancelled, with the Applicant reserving the right to prosecute this claim or a similar claim in a continuing application. Cancellation of claim 14 is not to be construed as an admission as to the validity of the rejection or the applicability of the cited art.

Independent claim 17 stands rejected under Section 103(a) as unpatentable over Jaisimha, Mairs, Matsushiro, Cullen, Imade and Kelly.

Claim 17 has been amended as set forth above to overcome the cited rejections. In particular, paragraph "(h) overlaying a map of the geographical area over the visual image" has been added. Support for these revisions can be found primarily in paragraphs [0009] and [0019].

None of the cited art discloses this feature in conjunction with the other elements of amended claim 17.

Independent claim 18 stands rejected under Jaisimha, Mairs, Matsushiro, Cullen, Imade, and Kelly and further in view of Wendt (4,422,180).

Claim 18 has been amended as set forth above. The remarks set forth with regard to the rejection of claim 1 and the limitations added thereto according to this amendment apply with equal force to claim 18 and its amendments.

Dependent claims 19 and 20 have been rejected under Section 103(a) over one or more of Jaisimha, Mairs, Matsushiro, Cullen, Imade, Kelly, Wendt, Marey (3,916,436) and Waguri (6,370,278). Each of these claims is believed distinguishable over the art of record as each claim depends from amended claim 18 and includes elements that further distinguish the cited art. Claim 20 has been amended for consistency with the amendments to its independent claim 18.

It is deemed unnecessary to comment on the propriety of the art combinations set forth by the Examiner to reject the various claims. Although the Examiner has suggested that the combinations are permissible since they are in the same field of endeavor of image processing. The prima facie obviousness rejection requires a clear and particular showing of a suggestion, teaching or motivation to combine the references. It is suggested that merely stating the references are in the same field of endeavor does not satisfy the prima facie test.

The Applicant has attempted to comply with all of the points raised in the Office Action and it is believed that the remaining claims in the application are now in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing amendments and discussion, it is requested that the Examiner's claim rejections have been overcome. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider these rejections and objections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all the claims pending in the application.

If a telephone conference will assist in clarifying or expediting this Amendment or the claim changes made herein, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,



John L. DeAngelis, Jr.
Reg. No. 30,622
Beusse Wolter Sanks Mora & Maire, P.A.
390 N. Orange Ave., Suite 2500
Orlando, FL 32801
(407) 926-7710